DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 935 RC 010 700

AUTHOR James, Sally E.; Brooks, Joseph T.
TITLE Report on Indian Education; State of Washington.
INSTITUTION Washington State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Seattle.
PUB DATE Feb 74
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education; Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Problems; *Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal State Relationship; *Financial Problems; *Government Role; *Nonreservation American Indians; Parent School Relationship; Public Schools; Self Determination; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *American Indian Education; *Washington

ABSTRACT

Most treaties negotiated with Indian tribes between 1778 and 1868 contain a clause insuring that the federal government will provide Indians with full educational opportunity in exchange for their ceded lands. This promise has not been fulfilled. Indian students are dropping out of Washington schools at rates estimated between 38-60 percent; schools have not been meeting the apparent needs of Indian children. This failure is attributed to several factors. Parents have been discouraged or excluded from school decision making policy; in two districts where Indians have had some control, dropout rates dropped appreciably. Many teachers are ignorant or indifferent to their Indian students' needs and backgrounds; necessity exists for preparing more Indian teachers and sensitizing non-Indian teachers. Disparity exists over funding. Because of existing federal regulations, over half the Indian students are ineligible for funds specifically designed to help them, yet most local and state school systems are unresponsive to their needs unless federal funds are available. Among the eight recommendations concluding the report are: establishing responsibility in one state agency for improvement of Indian education; developing and expanding teacher training programs specifically related to the needs of Indian children; and enacting legislation to ensure that both urban and reservation Indians participate fully in state and local educational systems. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

REPORT ON INDIAN EDUCATION STATE OF WASHINGTON

- ED158935

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RC 010700

A Report of the Washington State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights Prepared for the Information and Consideration of the Commission

February 1974

LESTER & RAMONA SANDOVAL
6830 - 30th N.E. 523-3946
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98115

MEMBERSHIP

WASHINGTON STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO THE

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Carl Maxey - State Chairman
Spokane

Alberto G. DelValle
Seattle

Theresa A. de Shepro
Seattle

Winifred M. Duncan
Seattle

Suzy Erlich
Seattle

Fred T. Haley
Tacoma

Wilbur G. Hallauer
Orcville

Kenneth A. MacDonald
Seattle

Joseph McGavick
Seattle

C. Raymond Merriweather
Belleview

Ray Moore
Seattle

Alice J. Thwing
Burton

Prior to the publication of a report, State Advisory Committees afford to all individuals or organizations that may be defamed, degraded, or incriminated by any material contained in the report an opportunity to respond in writing to such material. All responses received have been incorporated, appended to, or otherwise reflected in the publication.

PREFACE

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. By the terms of the Act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, sex, religion or national origin: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote, study of legal developments with respect to denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such time as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

The State Advisory Committees

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

Recommendations to the United States Commission on Civil Rights

This report has been prepared for submission to the United States Commission on Civil Rights by the Washington State Advisory Committee. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are those of the State Advisory Committee and are based upon fact-finding trips in Washington by field representatives Sally E. James and Joseph T. Brooks from January through April, 1973, in addition to an open meeting March 30 and 31 in Seattle. Committee and staff investigations were coordinated by Philip Montez, director of the Commission's Western Regional Office. The report was reviewed and edited by staff members Charles A. Ericksen, Thomas V. Pilla and Ramona L. Godoy. The Committee wishes to also acknowledge the continuous assistance of Ms. Irene Garcia and Mrs. Grace Diaz during preparation of this report.

ATTRIBUTION: The findings and recommendations contained in this report are those of the Washington State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights and, as such, are not attributable to the Commission.

This report has been prepared by the State Advisory Committee for submission to the Commission, and will be considered by the Commission in formulating its recommendations to the the President and the Congress.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

Purpose of Washington State Advisory Committee Fact Finding Effort.....1

Sources of Information.....3

II. BACKGROUND.....4

Current Status.....4

Other Reports.....10

III. EDUCATION.....14

Status.....15

1. Dropout Rates.....21

2. Parental Involvement.....27

3. Teacher Training.....32

Programs.....38

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....44

V. RECOMMENDATIONS.....46

I

Introduction

Purpose of Washington State Advisory Committee Fact-Finding Effort

For more than one hundred years, governmental agencies, advisory committees and private citizens have studied and re-studied the "plight of the American Indian". While historical perspective is important to our understanding, what seems to be needed is an assessment of 1973 concerns and services.

In June, 1972, the Washington State Advisory Committee received a request from several representatives of Washington State Indian communities and organizations to conduct an investigation on the current status of both urban and rural Indians. Indian spokesmen alleged that their rights were abused as both Indians and as citizens of the State. Complaints were also heard that the general public misunderstood specific Indian rights and privileges despite the fashionable flood of concern for American Indians by the media.

Subsequent discussions with government officials and Indians suggested that despite continuous legislation, Federal and State reports, and statewide conferences, complaints from the Indian community had minimal impact in rectifying many past inequities. Therefore, the State Advisory Committee decided to undertake a fact-finding effort on American Indians in Washington.

The goal of this effort was three-fold. One, to publicize, and hopefully clarify, the current status of civil rights of Indians for the general public; two, to recommend steps for Federal, State, and local agencies to improve existing conditions if the allegations and

complaints were well-founded; and three, to assist Indians in determining ways to make their rights more secure.

In addition to a general review of the status of Indians in this State, the Committee examined problems related specifically to education and administration of justice. Some allegations were confirmed; others were not. But our most discouraging and most critical finding was the breakdown of communication between Indians and the governmental agencies responsible for providing them services. The Washington State Governor's Indian Affairs Task Force issued a report in 1971 entitled "Are You Listening Neighbor?". According to our findings, neighbors are still <u>not</u> listening to one another.

Sources of Information

The findings of the Washington State Advisory Committee were derived from several sources. One, on March 30 and 31, 1973, the Committee held an open meeting to solicit testimony from Indians and Federal, State, and county officials. This testimony focused on two issues of major concern to Indians within Washington: education and administration of justice.

Two, from January through April, Commission staff from the Western Regional Office interviewed more than sixty persons in Washington and collected data from more than ten Federal, State, and local agencies on the current status of Indians residing throughout the state.

Three, Committee members and Commission staff reviewed recent national and State testimony, court decisions, studies and reports related to American Indians, in general, and Washington Indians in particular. This review helped the Committee to place the issues and concerns in perspective and to highlight the specific and unique situation within the State of Washington.[1/]

This report will concern itself with findings and recommendations related to educational problems of Indians in the State of Washington. In the future, the Committee will issue its report on administration of justice.

1/ A selected bibliography of the documents reviewed by Committee members and staff is on file in the Western Regional Office, available on request.

II

Background

Current Status

Washington State is seventh in the 50 United States in population of federally-recognized Indians, and tenth in proportion of Indian population to total population.[2/] There are 36 federally-recognized tribes within the State, ranging in size from several hundred members to more than 6,000 members. Some of these tribes have little or no land base, and consequently, no economic base; these tribes are called "non-reservation" and are concentrated for the most part along the Western Washington coastline. Two other groups of Indians account for most of the remaining Indian population: "reservation" and "urban".

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) reported in 1970 that the United States census identified 33,386 Indians residing in the state; 15,845 of these resided on reservations, or derived services from Federal Indian Area Offices or their subdivisions.[3/] In September, 1972, the BIA reported that 18,000 tribal members resided on reservation lands, 7,360 of whom were under 16 years of age, and 964 over 64 years of age. A total of 2,727 of the 10,000 members

2/ The States and Their Indian Citizens, United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1972 (p. 176-177).

3/ Ibid.

between these age groups 17-64 years old were unemployed.[4/] More than 2,500 tribal members resided elsewhere in the State; and presumably, they received some tribal member benefits such as per capital payments, Indian health services, and/or other BIA services.

In 1970 BIA reported that almost 16,000 Indians lived in Indian country, which is somewhat larger than a reservation including right of ways, dependent Indian communities and Indian allotments;[5/] thus, this population increased by nearly 2,000 persons from 1970 to 1972. Assuming that urban Indian populations increased at approximately the same rate, we can estimate that in 1972 more than 15,000 Indians (40 percent of the State's total Indian population) resided in urban or rural areas other than Indian country. These Indians received few or no support services from the BIA. In addition, unknown numbers of Canadian Indians migrate yearly to establish temporary or permanent residence within the state.

Washington State is one of few states in the Union with a large urban Indian population. The concerns of urban Indians were articulated during the open meeting and confirmed during staff interviews.

4/ Mimeograph, Bureau of Indian Affairs Portland Area Office; "Summary of General Statistical Information by Agency, Reservation, Tribe and State", September 14, 1972.

5/ "Indian Country" includes reservation land, right of ways, all dependent Indian communities whether within the original or subsequently acquired territory and all Indian allotments, the titles to which have not been extinguished. See The States op. cit., p. 35.

Mr. Herbert Barnes, representing the Small Tribes of Western Washington, made a special plea for acknowledgement of the non-reservation Indian.

> The landless, and urban and small tribe Indians continue to suffer the inequities thrust upon them by administrative acts that are not subjecting their directives and policies to conform to treaty obligations and laws enacted by Congress. It is fair to state that our civil rights are being grossly circumvented....The small tribes and landless Indians and the urban Indians are tantamount to outcasts, disowned by large tribes and unrecognized by the Federal government as to rights. The loss of recognition and the lack of material resources magnify discrimination and multiply our problems.
>
> Appropriations are never allocated to meet the needs of our people, whose needs are as great as those who are recognized by the BIA and the Federal Government.

Governmental responsibility for Indians in Washington State is divided among county, State, and Federal authorities. A majority of the general public falsely believes that the Federal Government has responsibility for providing all services to all Indians. In Washington State this is certainly not true. Not only is the State responsible for providing services to many rural and urban Indians, but the State has assumed responsibility for providing some legal and social services for Indians on reservations. The confusion over responsibility is compounded because the extent of State jurisdiction varies from reservation to reservation.

Within the last few years some of the larger reservations with economic resources have allocated tribal funds to provide their members with legal and social services, assuming de facto jurisdiction. They argue that the Federal Government has betrayed its trust responsibilities and that the State government ignores the unique

status of its Indian citizens. Unfortunately, over 60 percent of Washington State's Indian citizens are unable to negotiate for services or resort to the alternative of providing for themselves.[6]

For clarity, where possible, we have separated the urban problems from the reservation and rural problems, and the issues of Federal responsibility from issues of State and local responsibility.

However convenient for clarity these divisions may be, a cautionary note is advisable. First, testimony was received from both urban and reservation Indian representatives that

> There are three distinct and different Indian groups; these are reservation Indians, non-reservation Indians, and urban Indians. And these three groups of Indians should not have to compete with each other for the various scarce resources allocated to aid Indians. I'm sure you've had this said to you many times before, but I think again it's important to remember that one Indian is not necessarily like another Indian, that all tribes are different and that they need to be recognized as unique and distinct.[7]

Second, "buck passing" is an unfortunate given in most bureaucracies. Testimony from Federal, State, and local officials showed this phenomenon to be true for those agencies with service responsibilities to Washington Indians. City and county officials claimed

---

6/ Reservation and non-reservation Indians pay Federal and State income taxes just as any other U.S. citizen. Because certain tax exemptions are available on a reservation, in much the same way other Federal property is tax exempt, a popular myth has circulated that Indians pay no taxes.

7/ Ms. Pam Root, Washington State Advisory Committee open meeting transcript, March 30-31, 1973. Unless otherwise noted, all direct quotations in this report are derived from this transcript. The transcript is a public document available upon request. Others who similarly described the various Indian groups in the state included Mr. Wendell George, Mr. Herbert Barnes, and Mr. Willard Bill.

State legislators and administrators limited their effectiveness through laws, regulations, and minimal funding. State officials claimed that Congressional, Judicial, and Executive foot-dragging prohibited initiating new programs, defining precise policy, or expanding workable solutions. Federal officials claimed that they were powerless to enforce treaties or Federal regulations because a) enforcement was another Federal agency's responsibility, or b) they could only "suggest" appropriate action to a State or local agency.

While "buck passing" occurred with discouraging repetition, positive action and programs seemed to result when governmental agencies and Indian community leaders and members worked together. Therefore, while we will attempt to recommend specific ways different governmental units may better fulfill their respective responsibilities, we recognize that cooperation and coordination of responsibility among all concerned parties should be the primary goal of government at all levels.

Unfortunately, budget and staff limitations prohibited the Committee from analyzing in depth every issue related to Indians which was brought to our attention. It in no way diminishes the importance of such issues. For example, the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services was frequently mentioned as being unresponsive to the needs of the State's Indian citizens. In response to an inquiry by the Committee Chairman, Department officials stated that they were indeed working toward a more equitable and sensitve administration of services for Indians.[8/]

8/ Letter to Chairman Carl Maxey from the Department of Social and Health Services, April, 1973.

The Washington State Advisory Committee intends to continue communication with this department and to assist in any way possible to insure prompt and effective improvements within its program. Other issues frequently mentioned by witnesses from the Indian community included housing, Federal health programs, and public and private employment.

Other Reports

Several recent reports on the status of American Indians were of particular importance to our fact-finding efforts. Four of these were especially useful:

1. The Governor's Indian Affairs Task Force Report "Are You Listening Neighbor?" 1971. This report was released in February, 1971, following six months of statewide meetings and conferences on the unique concerns of rural and reservation Indians throughout the state. The report was a joint effort of the Governor's Indian Advisory Committee (formed by Governor's Executive Order) and the Governor's Advisory Council on Urban Affairs. While directing many of its findings and recommendations toward governmental officials, the report also attempted to educate the general public on the realities of Indian life while dispelling myths and stereotypes.

   Our Committee noted with concern that the Task Force report received minimal attention by State leaders and the general public. With the exception of several defeated bills in the 1972 and 1973 State Legislature,[9/]

9/ During this two-day open meeting, both Indians and State officials stated that the Task Force report had received minimal attention. In addition, staff interviews with Ed Mackie, Attorney General's Office; Pam Root, Department of Public Instruction; Sherwin Broadhead, Superintendent, Colville Reservation suggested the lack of attention given this report.

few of the report's recommendation were reviewed, argued, or much less implemented.

During the March open meeting, Indians testified that the State's reaction to the report was only one more example of the "benign neglect" they confront daily.

2. The States and Their Indian Citizens, Department of Interior, BIA, Washington, D.C., 1972. This is one of more recent reports on the relationship of states to Indian citizens. Written for the BIA, it necessarily focuses on reservation and near-reservation Indians who are more likely to receive services from both Federal and state sources.

   The State Advisory Committee found this report helpful in analyzing the relationship of Washington State government to Indians in comparison with similar relationships in other states. While written prior to recent reorganization efforts within the BIA, the report also clarified the exact responsibilities and limitations of that agency.

3. Washington State Indian Affairs: A Brief on Issues and Policies, 1972-1973, Governor's Indian Advisory Council, 1973. Within the last year, the Governor's Indian Advisory Council instituted quarterly meetings with the State's Congressional representatives. Indian representatives in the State hoped that periodic discussions of issues and concerns, with follow-up, would produce some action at the Congressional level. This mimeographed report is an effort to update the issues and concerns of reservation and rural

Indians as expressed in the 1971 Task Force Report; however, it acknowledges the "caught between two societies" dilemma of the urban Indian.[10/]

4. American Indians in the Southwest, United States Commission on Civil Rights, May 1973. The Commission on Civil Rights has been conducting a national study of the status of American Indians. The Washington State Advisory Committee's fact-finding efforts are not only of direct concern to us, as residents of this State, but are also part of a national effort.

This Committee reviewed the Southwest report to identify the similarity of issues among the diverse Indian tribes and individuals in this nation and also it identified issues of unique concern to Indians of this State.

We found many similarities in concerns of Indians in the Northwest and the Southwest toward the impact of public educational institutions. Both the Southwest report and our findings showed a disproportionately high rate of dropouts from public schools. A disproportionately low number of Indians were found in teaching and administrative positions in both areas. Indian community members and

10/ Washington State Indian Affairs, p. 10. The Task Force is currently in the process of preparing a report on urban Indians.

parents in both areas were found to have little say in the educational programs for their children.

Federal and state jurisdictional disputes in law enforcement and social services prevailed in both the Northwest and the Southwest, with the exception of Arizona which has not assumed law and order jurisdiction on reservations.

III

Education

If a man loses anything and goes back and looks carefully for it, he will find it. That is what the Indians are now doing when they ask you to go give them the things that you promised them in the past. I do not consider that they should be treated like beasts and that is the reason I have grown up with the feeling that I have. I feel that my country has gotten a bad name and I want it to have a good name. It used to have a good name, and I sit sometimes and wonder who is it that is giving it a bad name.

Chief Sitting Bull, 1883

Status

According to Dr. Frank Brouillet, Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), 13,126 Indian children were identified as enrolled in Washington public schools (K-12) in October, 1972.[11/] In September of the same year, the BIA reported that nearly half of these, or 6,244 Indian children, under its trust responsibility attended public schools in this state since there are no federal Indian schools in Washington. In addition, the BIA reported that in 1972, 419 Indian children from Washington tribes attended federal schools in Oregon and elsewhere.[12/] Willard Bill, School of Education, University of Washington, suggested that Indian students from Washington were attending out of state schools because they were not effectively served by the State's public schools:

> At present time there are over 600 students at the Chemawa Indian Boarding School in Oregon; many of those students are students who have been either expelled or dropped out, pushed out of the Washington public school system.... We have over 600 students in the Northwest going to one boarding school and others going to other boarding schools, because the public school is not meeting their needs.

Mr. Emmett Oliver, Supervisor of Indian Education for SPI testified that 42 school districts in the State currently receive Johnson

11/ "Minority Enrollments in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - State of Washington", October 1972, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington, mimeograph, p. 90.

12/ "Summary of General Statistical Information", Portland Area Office.

O'Malley (JOM) funds from the Federal Government.[13] These funds are specifically allocated for improving educational opportunities for Indian children. A regulation of these funds limits their use for reservation or near-reservation children.[14] Consequently, only 6,000 Indian children may receive benefit from the JOM program, while over 50 percent of the Indian school children in Washington are considered ineligible. Mr. Oliver told the Committee:

> The crying need in this State is to do something about the Indian children who do not qualify for Johnson O'Malley and it hurts me very much to administer a program for reservation Indian children when the need is just as great or even greater in some communities that do not qualify for the Johnson O'Malley program.

Further testimony suggested that more lenient regulations have gradually been allowed by the Federal Government. The Superintendent of Seattle Public Schools Forbes Bottomly indicated that JOM Funds recently helped supplement that district's Indian Heritage Program.

However, other testimony suggested that JOM bears the brunt of funding most programs specifically designed to alleviate problems for Indians in public schools. Other Federal funds, earmarked specifically for Indians, were impounded in 1972 by the Federal

---

13/ See also "Directory of Public Schools Served by Johnson O'Malley, Fiscal Year 1973", Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C. In Fiscal Year 1973 only 39 JOM projects were funded in Washington.

14/ "Johnson O'Malley Act of April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596) As Amended by the Act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458) in "Johnson O'Malley Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972", Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, Mimeograph. Also "Contracts with Public Schools Public Law 73-167--Johnson O'Malley Act--April 16, 1934." Bureau of Indian Affairs Regulations, mimeograph, 3 pages.

administration. Federal, State, and Indian community witnesses expressed confusion and dismay at the impounding of the 18 million dollar Indian Education Act appropriation. None could suggest how to release this money, though all concurred on its need.

Mr. Oliver said:

> We not only learned that the administration impounded this 18 million dollars earmarked for the education of Indian children, we learned from Washington, D. C. that these funds were rescinded.
>
> And again I would like to go on record as opposing this statement by the Undersecretary, Mr. Whitaker, in which he points out that the Congress has done nothing in two and a half years in this matter of Indian education. I feel that if he represents the administration, that there is one way to help, and that is to get these funds out in Indian country where they were intended.

Superintendent Bottomly was also questioned by the Committee about these Federal funds.

The Chairman:

> As a school administrator for many years, how could you possibly reconcile the withholding of...18 million dollars under Title IV allotted for...Indian education, by the President?
>
> Is there anyway you could reconcile that with the needs as you see them?

Mr. Bottomly:

> No it's impossible to reconcile it with the needs. The needs are here, the needs are greater than the effort, as a matter of fact, that has been made by the Federal Government and on the State level also. And I think it's a great disservice, a great step backward, as a matter of fact, not only to withhold the funds but to move to the revenue sharing effort, and by doing away with categorical funding.

> On June 25, 1973, the New York Times stated that the $18 million appropriation had been released, but had to be contracted out within five days, by June 30.

Earlier in his testimony, Mr. Bottomly expressed concern about the overall national policy toward Indians and other minorities:

> The problems of Indian education, the problems of minority people generally, the problems of poor people generally, have not been met sympathetically in the past, on the State and local level. And I have a great concern that the national failure by passing back to the local and State officials, the responsibility for handling these programs through revenue sharing, it seems to me that this is a national responsibility and a Federal program should be developed in a categorical way to zero in on these kinds of specific national problems...
>
> I have great concern for the future of programs to specifically alleviate the problems of minority groups in this country.

Several witnesses emphasized the burden on JOM funds when they testified to the reluctance of the State government to assume some responsibility for the education of Indian children. For example, Mr. Oliver state:

> I think fundamentally the Department of Education and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has taken very little leadership, if any, in the direction of Indian education, very little...
>
> What programs have gone on in the State of Washington for Indian children have been /due to/ federal money.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Brouillet responded to this charge by informing the Committee that there was a conference

of Indian parents and advisors with his office.[15] However, the Committee noted that this conference was limited to those advisory groups concerned with JOM funds. We wonder what the State's commitment to Indian education would be if Federal JOM monies were eliminated. Dr. Roy Sterns, Director of Education for the Portland Area Office of the BIA, concurred that the State Department of Public Instruction evidenced minimal concern in providing programs for Indian children.

A staff member of SPI, Ms. Pam Root, commented:

> The State tends to forget that Indians do attend public schools and so should receive their just proportion of public school money. The only time that any school district or that the State as a whole gets concerned about Indians is when the Federal Government dangles some money in front of them to write a program.

Ms. Root also delineated for the Committee the distribution of Urban, Rural, Racial and Disadvantaged Program (URRD) funds--State monies--for rural and disadvantaged students of the State.

> There is no State money allocated for Indian education. The only possible source of funds is through a program called URRD. About $4.5 million is allocated annually for this program. Of this $4.5 million, $278,362 or six percent of the money was earmarked for Indian education. This is despite the fact that Indian people have the highest dropout rate and the lowest success rate in the State schools.[16]

15/ Letter from Dr. Frank B. Brouillet, Superintendent of Public Instruction, to Chairman Carl Maxey dated April 13, 1973.

16/ "URRD Categorical Objectives 1972-73 (Program District Cost By Program)", Equal Educational Opportunity, Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1973. Mimeograph, one page.

Although Indians do receive about six percent of these State funds, the URRD program for Indians is concentrated in six school districts. According to Ms. Root, URRD money should be distributed to those with the most need, those who have less access to other Federal and State resources and less ability to generate their own resources; but she suggested that this is not the case.

> In looking at the breakdown of urban and rural monies, 75 percent of the URRD allocation goes to urban centers, with only 25 percent of it going to rural school districts who are in the greatest need because they have so few resources in their own communities....
>
> These funds should be categorized by reservation, non-reservation, and urban Indians. As it exists, the URRD funds force Indians to compete against each other for a very small share of the money. Funding bills for Indian people should be written so that reservation, non-reservation, and urban groups need not compete against each other for the same money.17/

Washington State's Indian student population is only 1.7 percent of the total student population.18/ Not surprisingly, neither State or local governments, in most cases, have allocated significant resources to service this relatively small group. However, from the open meeting testimony and staff interviews, the Committee found that the majority society failed to fully acknowledge treaty responsibilities and resultant obligations. Ms. Morris of the Lummi Tribe described the responsibilities of the majority society to Indians as follows:

> Indian people might be recognized as minority people, because in a sense of the terminology of minority, we are a small group. But we are

17/ Ibid.

18/ See Footnote #11.

> not to be piled along with the Black, the Chicano, with all the rest of the segments of other so-called minority people within this country....We have a nation within a nation. We have a body within this body..../The/ treaty must be respected, it must be lived up to. We're not asking for something that does not belong to us. We are asking for a return of promises that were granted through that treaty.
>
> This is the difference....the treaty obligations signed by the Federal Government.

Most treaties negotiated with Indian tribes between 1778 and 1868 contained a clause insuring that the Federal Government would provide Indians with full educational opportunity in exchange for their ceded lands.[19/] Subsequent testimony during the March open meeting suggested that, in most instances, Indian students were not receiving an equal educational opportunity either as citizens of the State or as recipients of treaty agreements. In addition to the questionable distribution of funds, the Committee received testimony which supported the conclusion of unequal educational opportunity for Indians in three other areas: 1) dropout rates, 2) parental involvement, and 3) teacher training.

1. Dropout Rates

Indians and government officials at all levels agreed that dropout rates for Indian students were excessively high. The Portland Area BIA completed a needs assessment report on Indian high school students in March, 1973.[20/] The report found that 44 high

19/ See United States Commission on Civil Rights Staff Report on Federal Policy and Program for American Indians, November, 1972.

20/ Dropout Survey and Educational Needs Assessment, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland Area, March, 1973.

schools within its service area (Washington, Idaho, Oregon and Alaska) reported 626 Indian dropouts in grades 9-12 during the 1970-1972 school year; the total Indian enrollment in these schools during these two years ranged from 1,528 to 1,632. The report also stated that various factors made this figure "clearly below the true figure".[21/] For example, this figure does not include 147 school age Indian children not presently enrolled or registered.

Mr. Oliver of the DPI stated:

> I think we keep beating statistics on dropouts; they range all the way from 38 percent to 60 percent of Indian children. The State of Washington does not have a creditable record in graduating Indian children from the public school system.

Ms. Root said:

> Indian education in this State, with the exception of about two schools....has been a monumental failure. We the Equal Educational Opportunity Office of DPI estimate generally that our dropout rate runs in excess of 60 percent from kindergarten to twelfth grade. Many of our students dropped out after the eighth grade, and this dropout rate is beginning to move downward into the sixth grade.

According to Ms. Root, dropout rates by ethnic group are not collected by the State Department of Public Instruction; therefore, with the exception of the BIA's recent assessment within its Portland Area responsibility, actual dropout rates are "guesstimates".

Superintendent Bottomly reflected on this problem in his testimony. In this school year, 1972-73, he said:

21/ Ibid. p. 7.

> There are only 29 Indian students in the twelfth grade /out of a total of 889 Indian students in Seattle schools/. This compares with 13 in 1971-72, and 22 in 1970-71. A small number of Indian students who are still in school in the twelfth grade indicates a large dropout rate amongst the students.

Ethnic counts are tabulated in Seattle schools from visual observation by teachers.[22/] Dr. Bottomly commented that many Indians complain to him that counts are low because teachers are unable to make accurate ethnic determination.

Lenore Thresher, Director of the American Indian Heritage program in the Seattle schools, echoed Dr. Bottomly's concern about inaccurate counts and the effects of such inaccuracies.

> Mr. Bottomly indicated that we had 29 Indian students who were graduating from high school this year. According to our identification in our records, we have approximately 50 to 55 Indian students. I think this points out another thing about the teacher's ability to make a visual identification of Indian students. We get to know the Indian students. When we have developed the rapport, then we are able to go in and say, "what kind of Indian are you? Can we give you any assistance?"

The former chairman of the Health, Education and Welfare Committee of the Colville Confederated Tribe, Lucy Covington, testified that dropout rates for reservation students in Eastern Washington were at least as high, if not higher, than those of the more urbanized Western Washington. She stated that in one high school serving the Colville Reservation, the following dropout

22/ This practice was acknowledged by Dr. Bottomly, Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, during testimony before the State Advisory Committee.

data were recorded: In the 1972-1973 school year, 25.3 percent of all the students enrolled in the ninth grade dropped out, while 49 percent of the Indian students dropped out. In the 1970-1971 school year, 34 percent of all students dropped out--55 percent of all the Indian students dropped out. There were approximately 1,600 students in the whole school, of whom approximately 160 were Indian. She added that for the last three years, "the Colvilles have averaged over 85 students per year who have gone to 'far away' boarding schools".[23/]

Staff interviews suggested another factor affecting dropout rates and dropout causes. Willard Bill, University of Washington, told Commission staff that Indian students were sometimes "pushed out" of public schools by teachers and principals:

> Although parents and students must usually request transfers to BIA boarding schools, these requests often originate from the schools which feel that an Indian student does not 'fit in'.

He suggested that dropout rates issued by State and Federal authorities were probably low because they did not reflect what happened to these "push-outs". "We just don't know," he concluded, "how many of these youngsters really continue on at boarding schools or elsewhere. The public schools record only that the student has transferred."[24/]

23/ Prepared statement of Ms. Covington submitted to the Committee during its open meeting. The data in Ms. Covington's statement was not refuted or verified by that school district.

24/ Staff interview with Mr. Willard Bill, February, 1973, on file in the United States Commission on Civil Rights Western Regional Office.

The dilemma of the "pushed-out" student was affirmed by testimony from Maria James, an Indian student from Sequim, Washington. She told the Committee:

> I think another problem is poor motivation.... They don't like to speak up in class. They think they're going to make a fool of themselves or something. This lack of sufficient counseling service was my biggest problem. I dropped out after my first year of high school. And a lot of them, including myself, I guess, were too passive to ask for help. They didn't want to trust a white counselor that they had there. I understand that now they have counselor aides, an Indian counselor aide, but my understanding of it is that the aides don't last too long there. They stay for a few weeks and then they quit. I don't know the exact reasons, but I would imagine probably because they wouldn't be able to get along with the principal there.
>
> And it's been pretty much segregated along the line of social groups and everything. All the time I was in high school there was never an Indian cheerleader or anything like that, never an Indian student body president, and the /other/ students there tend to look down on the Indian students.

Mary Ellen Hillaire, now an instructor in a community college and a recipient of a White House Fellowship, described her failure in the public school system.

> Most of the Native American students fail in white terms, even if they are successful in their own native traditions. I think I am an example of this type of a situation. I was kicked out of school when I was in the third grade because they said I had an IQ of 72, insufficient to be /educated/. So they talked my parents into taking me out of school, because it would hurt me more to go to school and have the ridicule than it would not to have been in any school at all....

> Since that time, through several mistakes which worked for the first time in the right direction, I was able to get my high school diploma and subsequently work on three degrees, the first in sociology and anthropology, the second in social work, and the third in education.

The Portland Area BIA dropout survey identified 12 reasons for Indian's high dropout rates (other than expulsions or suspensions). The reasons were divided into two areas. The first area included "other educational programs, marriage, armed services, medical, moved, and employment".[25/] These reasons accounted for 36 percent of the cases studied. The second area included "lack of interest, difficulties in the home, non-attendance, inability to adjust to the school, academic failure, and court action" and accounted 64 percent of the cases.[26/] According to the report, these reasons were identified by school personnel and tribal educational representatives. There were no data on the students reasons for dropping out. However, the report noted:

> Lack of interest, non-attendance, inability to adjust to the school, and academic failure undoubtedly grow out of the inability of the schools to meet the unique needs of Indian youth.[27/]

Mr. Ron Sullivan, a supervisor in the Auburn School District, commented:

> From day one when Indian children enter school, they are told and reminded that they are not competitive, they do not have the potential to learn. They are

25/ Dropout Survey, p. 8.

26/ Ibid. p. 8 and 9.

27/ Ibid.

> told they should direct their intellectual efforts toward a vocational occupation. They are told they really don't have the "smarts" to finish high school or go on to college. But yet they are told by the same people to finish school and go on to college so that they may go back and help their own people. Whether or not the general public believes it, we would like to finish school and return to help our people. We would like to have our own school system that would teach our history, our own psychology and sociology comparatively to what the dominant culture teaches. 28/

2. Parental Involvement

The question of Indian parental involvement in policy and decision making has been a national issue for some time. 29/ Testimony and staff interviews indicated to the Committee that this issue is also an important concern within Washington State.

Several witnesses described how existing school systems have excluded parental participation, either by design or by district boundaries. JOM funding, Federal funds specifically earmarked since 1939 to assist Indian children, requires that a board of Indian parents advise school administrators on the use of this money. Lucy Covington of the Colville Reservation claimed:

> The Johnson O'Malley Program has and will continue to be a relatively ineffective program. The Indian parents are formed into an advisory board charged with the

28/ Written statement submitted by Mr. Sullivan to the Committee during its open meeting.

29/ See especially An Even Chance, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., Graphics 4; Annandale, Virginia, 1971.

> responsibility to develop a budget and program for the school involved. However, the Superintendent and the School Boards are in a position to veto, directly or indirectly, the JOM Program developed by the parents. The final result is a slowly dissolving process of the JOM Parent Committee in which no parental involvement survives.

State Superintendent Brouillet did not deny that parent committees have been ignored or overlooked in the past; rather, he stressed the "great strides already this year* in assisting Indian parent committees to organize." He added that in April of this year,

> The first* meeting of Indian representatives from six Consortia organized throughout the State was held in this office. The twelve Indians present represented 6,000 Indian children.

The parent Consortia to which Dr. Brouillet referred is restricted to parents whose children attend schools receiving JOM funds. There are 42 such school districts throughout the State now receiving JOM money.[30/]

Mr. Harold Patterson, JOM Coordinator in the Department of Public Instruction, stated:

> The meaningful and effective involvement of Indian adults in the educational system will have a beneficial effect upon the Indian children who attend public schools in several ways:
>
> 1. It will enable school systems to be more responsive to the needs and problems of Indian students.

30/ Letter from Dr. Frank Brouillet, op. cit. It should be noted that this meeting was held following our hearing in March, 1973.

*Italics added

2. It will enable Indian parents to better understand what they can do to help their children succeed in school.

3. It will place the Indian sector in a better position to make positive contributions to education and society from the riches of its own culture.

4. It will enable Indian communities to utilize educational resources to develop their own human and material resources and thus enter a more productive and satisfying role in society.31/

Parental participation through the JOM program can potentially reach only one half of the Indian student population in this State

Ms. Root, DPI, claimed that, with one exception--the URRD program--the State provides no funds to meet the special needs of Indian children. She pointed out that parent committees as well as school programs for Indians are financed totally by Federal funds, and asked:

> What happens if the State no longer receives Federal funds? What happens to the remaining 7,000 Indian children in our schools not eligible for JOM funding?....The Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of Washington does not have nor has he ever had a statewide advisory committee on Indian education. We would like this committee to support a recommendation that a statewide advisory committee on Indian education, composed of Indian people, representing reservation, non-reservation, and urban Indians (in subcommittees) be immediately established to advise the Superintendent directly on issues related to Indian education and that sufficient funds be provided for this committee to function effectively.

31/ Written statement submitted by Dr. Patterson during the Committee's open meeting.

National and local concern over abuses in the use of JOM funds has caused State administrators to enforce regulation guidelines more rigidly. One Committee member asked the State Supervisor of Indian Education, Emmett Oliver:

> Do you find much abuse of JOM monies as to what they're designed for by the school system?
>
> For instance, do you find many school systems buying materials for the whole school system rather than using these monies for the Indian children?

Mr. Oliver:

> I would have to admit that this has existed in some instances. Where we do find it, we do have auditors go out and check.
>
> We did uncover a situation about a year ago where there was a violation; a school district was obliged to return some money to the State. We are calling attention to local school districts, the clearcut guidelines for Johnson O'Malley money; and while this has happened, we can't blame the school districts entirely.... Schools in the State of Washington enjoyed for some time receiving funds from Johnson O'Malley and didn't know what it was to be used for and it hasn't been but for the past few years that we have made this clear and so we're having to clean it up, so to speak.

Parents are also excluded from participating in their children's education by what is essentially a school boundary problem. Ms. Root described the consequences of this problem.

> In the State of Washington a person must be resident in a school district in order to vote for school board or to run for school board. Where his child attends school he has no influence on his participation.
>
> Only four of the school districts which are on Indian reservations go past grade eight. For the remainder of their schooling these children must be bused off a reservation to schools which are

> outside of the school district in which they live. At this time, their parents have no further control over their education because they are not now residents in their new school district. They may not vote for board members nor may they run, and there is no requirement for any kind of relationship to exist between the elementary district and the high school district boards....For example, the Colville reservation is served by seven separate and distinct school districts in three different counties. This necessitates tribal resources being divided up to deal with seven different boards of directors, seven superintendents, and seven different sets of policy codes, etc. Also, of course, their JOM money allocation is divided up into seven different pieces. Each district receiving a little piece of the money with no really coordinated effort being possible.

Ms. Root suggested:

> Resources could be consolidated to develop a better educational program and Indian people would be able to choose the policy makers for their schools. Without consolidation, the Colville Tribe is divided into many small pieces; and they are unable to muster sufficient votes to elect one of their own to the school board. In fact, because of the residency requirement, they cannot even vote for school board in four of the seven districts which their children attend.

Ms. Root suggested that until consolidation, an extremely complicated process, could become reality, the Superintendent of Public Instruction should support legislation

> Which would allow residents of non-high districts some voting privileges for school boards in the receiving high school district and that they have at least one board position reserved for them. If this is deemed not feasible, then the Washington State School Directors' Association /should/ adopt an administrative policy requiring that a formal relationship (such as joint meetings, reciprocal board positions, etc.) be established between the non-high and high school boards.

3. Teacher Training

Out of approximately 36,000 educators in Washington, there are 101 Indian educators, or 0.3 percent of the total number of teachers and administrators. Willard Bill testified that, to his knowledge, only three of those 101 educators had positions as administrators in the State's public schools.[32/] In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Bill described a major reason for students being "dropped out or pushed out of the public school system."

> Looking over the in-service work that I do with teachers in the field, and we've worked with perhaps 300 teachers in the last two years, the major problem there is that the teacher is not familiar with the American Indian child, not familiar with the child's background. The teachers are not familiar with the treaty rights: oftentimes they do not know there's a reservation in the school district in which they teach. They're completely uninformed....Those 36,000 people are still out there who have a very low knowledge about treaty rights, the negotiations that took place between the Federal Government and the tribes, sovereign tribes; and people have trouble understanding the American Indian situation because they try to compare it to their own background and it dosen't correlate and they become very confused.

Mary Ellen Hillaire, instructor at Evergreen College, echoed earlier testimony regarding the State's commitment or lack of commitment to provide Indians with an adequate education, and teachers of Indian students with adequate techniques for reaching these students.

32/ Mr. Bill's estimates on Indian administrators have not been verified or refuted by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

> If there is a single recommendation to this committee, it would be that some effort should be made to find out why state institutions, if they have had responsibility for Native Americans, why has not this been beyond the occasional special program or remedial program?.....
>
> It seems as though there could be better use put to these personnel of the State institutions toward a more realistic approach to Native American studies.

Finally, Ms. Hillaire related her experience in trying to help non-Indian teachers be more sensitive to the background and needs of Indian students.

> They say that by and large, Indian people and Indian students are prone to absenteeism, gross absenteeism, absenteeism that can never be excused, or justified.
>
> And then secondly, that these people have a very short interest span, that they cannot concentrate on understanding.
>
> And the third is that they are hostile. In fact, I heard a white teacher saying, of a group of Headstart youngsters, "Those youngsters, are dangerous, you just can't tell what they'll do, they're hostiles." And of course, knowing the age of Headstart people, four years old, it would take about, you know, 50 of them to do anything really dangerous.

Ms. Root expanded on these comments by suggesting that training relative to Indians and their culture should extend to teachers beyond those just working with Indian children.

> All teachers who are going into the public schools should have some training in Indian history and life style. Even if a teacher does not teach in an Indian school he influences the attitudes of white children about Indians. We would ask for support of the Indian Task Force recommendation that teacher training institutions be pressured to turn out either Indian teachers or white

> teachers who are adequately educated in sociology and anthropology, history from the Indian view point, contemporary Indian government, and Indian rights, psychology of minorities, counseling techniques for minorities and specialized teaching methods that will draw out non-white students who are products of an essentially intuitive and non-competitive culture.

Mr. Bill extended his conception of teacher training to include--for the benefit of the total society--the ethnic culture of all groups in our pluralistic society.

> I think it's particularly important that the future teacher take a block of ethnic studies courses, particularly if he doesn't work with ethnic groups.
>
> Probably that is our greatest need, trying to get this fact across, that there is really not an Indian problem; the real problem is the greater society which cannot recognize some of the needs of the Indian child, and also, I would say of the black child or Chicano....
>
> Regardless of where the teacher is going to teach, he should take a block of ethnic studies courses so he hears another perspective from what he may have heard in his past, and that therefore he will be a more effective teacher for all children.

Mr. Bill briefly described his efforts at the University of Washington to design and conduct such a comprehensive teacher training program. At the present time, he stated, there are approximately 20 people in the Center for Indian Education program; but the need is certainly much greater.

Supported by other witnesses, he encouraged the Committee to support State legislation requiring all teacher training programs to include courses and field work related to minorities, particularly the Native American. Dr. Bottomly agreed.

> I would agree with the need for a State requirement as part of the certification for education, and experience in multi-ethnic, multi-racial environments, teaching environments, I would agree with that; I think that's a major necessity. We have in the City of Seattle, because of this lack, spent really hundreds of thousands of dollars in in-service training to make it possible for those of us that didn't get that kind of education in the past to receive it on the job.

When questioned about the responsiveness of State colleges and the University to mandatory ethnic studies, Mr. Bill responded

> I don't think they have. I don't think there is a requirement across the board for most teachers; I think what will need to happen is at the State level institutions to require these blocks of time. And I think that's critical, because many of our institutions are losing their enthusiasm for American Indians to the degree that the Federal monies are disappearing.

One interim solution to improving education for Indian children involves the extensive use of Indian aides and counselors. The Committee found a hesitation in many school districts and the State department to continue or expand aide programs throughout the State.

Several witnesses saw this hesitance related again to the amount of Federal support available for such services. Ms. Root, in response to Committee questioning, suggested that aides were at best secondary employees in the school system.

> As long as Federal funds are available, aides will be hired. A lot of them are not doing what I would personally consider to be real teacher aide work. But we are working on that problem and some school districts are making some gains in that area. The realities of the teacher aide programs will be what happens when the Federal money to support it is cut back, and I think at that point you'll see that teacher aides will cease to exist.

Mr. Bill also commented on the inadequacies of the existing teacher aide programs. He was asked his recommendations for using aides and paraprofessionals to improve educational opportunities for Indian children.

He replied:

> We do continue to work with the State office, Johnson O'Malley office, in encouraging that teacher aides be used....throughout the system as helpers, particularly working with the Indian child....Our goal in that regard would be to provide a certification for those teacher aides so that they have an educational ladder that they can climb. At the present time, both within the BIA and the State System, our teacher aides are usually locked into the lowest paid job in the educational system; and we need to find a way in which we can certify these people.

In staff interviews, Mr. Bill further elaborated his ideas about aides. He reflected on the need for more "models" for Indian children. One way to bring more Indian adults into the public schools is through the aide program, he said.

> The problem right now is one of logistics. The potential aides, while qualified for these paraprofessional jobs, cannot relocate from their homes to the campus.
>
> And as soon as we can move to a university-without walls concept for these people, we will be able to certify those particular aides.

Ms. Hillaire suggested that there existed a deeper problem in relation to schools and the State hiring Indian teachers, aides, and other public servants, while also incorporating Indian perspectives into these jobs.

> I worked on a workshop given several years ago by the Governor to try to establish hiring policies that would be more favorable to minority people. In the group that I was the facilitator of, one of the white participants who was completely overwhelmed by the possibility of the step, literally got sick and vomited. And since then, it has sort of given me a vantage point to try and actually see what is the basic difficulty of getting Indian people, and in general minority people, employed.

In public testimony and staff interviews, Indian attested to trying many avenues, seeking solutions to the problems their children face in Washington public schools. The BIA Needs Assessment Report emphasized several times the need felt by Indian parents for an Indian boarding school.

> Indian parents have had a compelling need to give their children a better education than the local public schools were providing. Following 1957 when Chemawa was closed to Northwest Indians, many parents began sending their children as far away as Oklahoma, Arizona, and Nevada, rather than to the local public schools.33/

Chemawa in Oregon is again available for Indian students from Washington State, but it has only a 600 student capacity.

33/ Dropout Survey, p. 27.

Programs

The Committee received testimony about two approaches to Indian education which were credited with improving Indian students' achievement and curtailing dropouts. One school system is on a reservation, and one is in an urban area.

Ms. Root described the Taholah School on the Quinault Reservation in Western Washington:

> They are able, increasingly, to keep their children in school; they've not had a drop-out in two years since they took their seventh and eighth grade back from the white school that had it.
>
> And this is compared with a considerable number of dropouts in the white school before then, about 13 to 15 percent went before eighth grade.
>
> Taholah's been very effective, I think, because it's had an Indian school board for more than ten years; and their curriculum and instructional system is based on the process that was used traditionally by Quinault Indians to educate their children. It's a good example of what can be done in a school district, given enough time and resources.

Several Committee members expressed concern that the Taholah School system was essentially segregated. Ms. Root responded

> I think we have some very clear evidence that Indian children succeed, educationally, significantly better when they are in a school which is controlled by Indian people and when the school's instructional curriculum and disciplinary systems are consistent with traditional Indian ways.

> Desegration may be inconsistent with this goal.
>
> Now, some Indian people have indicated a desire to be integrated into the regular public school system; and they should be allowed to do so if this is their choice, but I think Indian people should not be compelled to do so.
>
> Now, some of you who believe in the concept of multi-ethnic society may find this concept objectionable; but I'd like to ask you to think about it from another point of view.
>
> If the Indian way of life is to survive and if Indian people are going to be able to sustain themselved economically so that we can be other than poor stepchildren of the United States Government, we're going to have to have young people who have the skills necessary to develop our land base and manpower resources into an economically productive system.
>
> In order to do this, we have to hold them in some kind of an educational system. And I think that has to be our first priority. A truly multi-ethnic society can never be successful so long as some of its members are viewed as superior and some are viewed as inferior. As long as Indian people have to rely upon the generosity of the United States Government to provide their basic services, they will never be viewed by white people as anything but inferior....
>
> When the tribes are economically self-sufficient, have educated their own people and can provide the services that their people need, then perhaps we will have time for the luxury of engaging in a multi-ethnic society.

Mr. Harold Patterson, Assistant Supervisor of Indian Education (JOM Program), SPI, and former superintendent at Taholah, submitted written material to the Committee which reinforced a possible need

for segregated education of Indian children.

> Treaties are binding agreements and ought to be honored without complaint or arguments since the non-Indians have already gotten everything that was guaranteed to them in the treaties, and more.
>
> The terms of the treaties include special educational assistance, as provided for in the JOM Indian Education Act. These educational provisions were negotiated by Indian leaders who foresaw that coming generations of Indian youth would need extra help to cope with the new life style forced upon them by the imposition of cultural change.
>
> Many educators whom we have contacted do not believe in JOM because they say it is racially oriented and grants unique status and privileges to Indians, which tends to create tensions vis-vis the non-Indian population.*
>
> Nothing is said by these educators about the century-old tensions which have existed in the Indian communities and within the souls of Indian students in public schools caused by the inherent advantage that non-Indians have enjoyed in schools and society because of the cultural bias characterizing these institutions.*34/

As an example of effective education for Indians in an urban setting, Dr. Bottomly and members of his staff described the four-year-old American Indian Heritage Program of the Seattle Public Schools. One Committee member noted that this program originated in the Indian community and testimony reflected that continuous

---

34/ See Footnote #31.

* The issue of separate education for Indians is not a new one in Washington State. In April, 1970, the State Board of Education and the State Board Against Discrimination issued a joint policy statement on equal opportunity and excellence in education. That statement recognized that "special attention should be given to American Indian communities because of the trust relationship with the federal government." (p. 1). The policy when describing rules and regulations relating to racial imbalance and school construction state that "this policy shall not apply to school serving American Indian communities." (p. 2). Statement on file in the United States Commission on Civil Rights Western Regional Office.

*Italics added.

cooperation and communication between the Indian community and the school system were imperative for the program's success.

Dr. Bottomly's description of the program included the following comments:

> This program is designed to work directly with Indian students in the Seattle School District. The major focus is not to reach the total school population as with a multi-ethnic curriculum, but rather to have Indian students specifically as a target population.
>
> Parent-community counselors from the Indian Heritage program are working in 20 schools which enroll approximately 770 Indian students. The counselors have worked with 55 dropouts; 44 have been placed in some form of educational program. These counselors assist pupils, assist parents in utilizing the help and social services of the community, assist teachers by interpreting the unique problems many of the Indian students face who are new to the urban setting, work directly with students in alleviating school problems, and serve as a valuable resource to the total Seattle District staff in advising on Indian-related matters.

Ms. Lenore Thresher, Director of the program, provided additional comments on the program's components and responded to complaints about its segregated services.

> It was initially funded through the Urban-Rural Racial Disadvantaged funding. Right now we're operating with kind of a multiple funding source; we also have Title I funds. We have alcoholism money coming into the program; and last year, we also received a Title II grant to develop a much-needed learning resource center....
>
> We have identified and are serving approximately 770 Indian students within the Seattle public schools. Some of the specific needs that the Indian Heritage Program has, is, number one, funding. We're always in need of additional funding, additional saving so we can give a more comprehensive service to Indian students.

> Right now we have received some, I guess, constructive criticism from other personnel within the Seattle public schools and this is, "Why don't we share our services with the non-Indian?" We would like to very much; but again, before we can go out and tell other people of the Indians, I think that we better take care of our Indian students right within Seattle public schools, make sure that they are in school, make sure that we are attempting to alleviate our high dropout rate, and then from there, go on out and help the non-Indian.

The Committee asked Ms. Thresher about the cooperation received from the school system in implementing the Indian Heritage Program. She suggested that cooperation has been a two-way effort. She said,

> We found that the Seattle School District has been very cooperative.
>
> I think that the Indian Heritage Program has been very effective in the school system; I think we've been able to utilize many of the services that the school system has to offer in reaching our Indian students and getting the kind of confidential files we need and this kind of a thing, so it has been very helpful to us.

Ms. Mary Jo Butterfield, a counselor in the Indian Heritage Program, was asked to comment on the program's effect in reaching potential dropouts.

> We go into the elementary, from the elementary to the junior and senior high level, because we kept getting calls on dropouts. And we have one staff member now who spends 20 hours a week working exclusively with dropouts, placing them. And before the end of the year, we are going to put a report together and hopefully send it to Indian agencies that we're aware of in regards to some of the things that we've been able to identify and work with in helping to keep these young people in school or placing them in other programs.

She added

> The impact of the Heritage Program on our students has been very positive. Children who had the heritage classes in the fifth and sixth grade, who are now in the seventh and eighth grade, in the junior high level, are more motivated, and much more comfortable with their Indian identity because they know what it is.

Both the Taholah and Seattle efforts suggested to the Committee positive alternatives for Indian children's education. We were interested in the potential for sharing these efforts with other schools in the State. Ms. Thresher stated that many urban and rural school districts nationally have inquired about the Seattle program.

> We have found that there is really not any Indian heritage program as unique as the one we have here in Seattle. Even in Eastern Washington I attended a JOM conference about a month ago, and the Colville people were very interested in starting a heritage program, and so the different tribes and reservations don't have something similar to our program.

When Ms. Butterfield discussed the Seattle program's efforts to diminish dropout rates, she was asked whether she would recommend that other Indian students be brought into Seattle rather than segregating them on reservations or relocating them to reservations.

She replied

> I'd suggest they /The SPI/ reorganize some of those /rural and reservation/ school boards and administrators and the teachers training them so those children do not have to leave and go away to another school. I think it's terrible that some of those teachers go into an Indian school with the attitudes that they have.

Both Taholah and Seattle schools have offered to share their experiences with other school districts. However, funding and time for these efforts are limited.

IV

Findings and Conclusions

While comparative data with other ethnic groups on dropouts was not available, our findings showed that Indian youngsters are failing or dropping out of Washington's public schools in large numbers. Even the lowest estimate of a 38 percent dropout rate is intolerable for any group. Indians, adults and students alike, complained that the schools more often than not discouraged Indian students from completing a basic education or continuing in higher education institutions. Educational administrators concurred that the schools have not been meeting the apparent needs of Indian children.

Several factors contributing to the schools' failure to provide educational opportunity were highlighted. One was the lack of Indian participation in the decision making of school policy and budgeting. In those two schools districts where Indians had some control over their own destiny, Taholah and Seattle, dropout rates seemed to drop appreciably.

A second factor apparently affecting the staying power of Indian children in schools was the quantity and quality of teacher training related to sensitivity to the cultural background and unique needs of Indian children. Again, Indians and educational administrators alike described the relative success of schools where teachers had some training to schools where teachers were indifferent or ignorant to their Indian students' needs and backgrounds.

Two model educational programs were described to the Committee, one on a reservation and on in an urban setting. Success in both programs apparently depended on multi-leveled cooperation and multi-leveled funding.

An overriding problem facing Indian students is the apparent disparity in funding programs. Over half of the Indian student population in Washington State is ineligible for Federal funds specifically designated to assist them. The Committee found that nearly all local and State School systems are unresponsive to the needs of Indian students unless Federal funds are available. Bureaucratic "buck passing" has apparently compounded the problem of unresponsiveness at the State level. No one governmental agency at Federal, State or local level acknowledges responsibility for providing and coordinating educational opportunities for Indian students.

V

Recommendations

In July, 1970, President Nixon submitted a message to Congress on Indian affairs.[35/] The message was well received by many Indians, and it was hoped that this latest policy statement and resultant activities would resolve many problems. In that message the President stated that only by rejecting both extremes of policy might the government achieve a policy which truly would serve the best interests of Indian peoples.

He said

> This then must be the goal of any new national policy toward the Indian people: to strengthen the Indian's sense of autonomy without threatening his sense of community. We must assure the Indian that he can assume control of his own life without being separated involuntarily from the tribal group. And we must make it clear that Indians can become independent of Federal control without being cut off from Federal concern and Federal support.

Specifically, the President made several recommendations to implement this latest policy and to resolve past conflicts and problems. One of these recommendations is pertinent to the findings of this Committee. It is:

> Indian Education
> We believe every Indian community wishing to do so should be able to control its own Indian schools. This control would be exercised by school boards selected by Indians and functioning much like other school boards throughout the nation....

35/ President Nixon's Message to Congress, July 8, 1970, Congressional Record, Washington, D.C.

> Johnson O'Malley money is designed to help Indian students, but since funds go directly to the school districts, the Indians have little if any influence over the way in which the money is spent. I therefore propose that....funds under this act /be channeled/ directly to Indian tribes and communities.... Every effort /must be made/ to insure that Johnson O'Malley funds which are presently directed to public school districts are actually spent to improve the education of Indian children in these districts.

The Washington State Advisory Committee felt that it would be useful to prelude our recommendations with this 1970 proposal of the President. We wish to note our concern that minimal action has been taken on this proposal at the Federal level. We support the President's policy, and we urge that the recommendation be implemented immediately. Indeed, implementation of this recommendation would help to alleviate many of the problems which we identified during our fact finding effort.

Washington State Advisory Committee Recommendations

We propose the following recommendations based on our findings.

1. There is a need for establishing responsibility within one State agency for the improvement of Indian education in the State of Washington. It would seem that this responsibility would rest with the Washington State Department of Public Instruction. The SPI should initiate and develop a task force made up of prominent educators and Native American citizens whose chief function should be proposals and recommendations for the improvement of Indian education in the State of Washington.

2. We urge the Washington State universities and colleges to begin immediately to develop and expand teacher training programs specifically related to the needs of Indian children. The State legislature should develop, propose and implement legislation requiring that courses and field work on all ethnic minority groups be part of teacher certification in Washington.

3. While the Committee finds it commendable that the State Superintendent has instituted a statewide consortium of Indians to advise on Johnson O'Malley funds and programs, we would recommend that a similar effort be expended for Indians who are not eligible for such funds and programs. The Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction should seek and the State Legislature should enact legislation for funds and staff to ensure that both urban and reservation Indians participate fully in State and local educational systems.

4. Communication remains an important element in effective education. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should assist local school districts in disseminating information about model educational programs for Indian children.

5. Testimony indicated to the Washington State Advisory Committee that even approaching ideal conditions, Indian children frequently find the cultural differences in the public schools a frightening, incomprehensible experience. Adults of Indian heritage will help alleviate these fears, as well as provide some cultural understanding of both the majority society and Indian communities. The unique educational problems facing many Indians must be recognized and persons must be hired to deal with these problems. Local school districts, in cooperation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, should actively recruit additional Indian teachers, teacher aides, counselors and administrators.

6. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare should implement new, or amend existing regulations to insure that representatives of the Indian community, both on reservations and in urban areas, have opportunity for participation in making policy for educational programs serving Indian children.

7. The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare should allocate sufficient funds to institutions of higher education for teacher training programs specifically directed to the needs and cultural background of Indian children.

8. This increase should include funding for both Johnson O'Malley programs on or near reservations and Department of Health, Education and Welfare programs in urban and rural areas. The President should seek and Congress should enact legislation substantially increasing funding for Indian education.

GPO 873-667